

# Ground-state properties of deformed proton emitters in the relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov model

G.A. Lalazissis<sup>1,3</sup>, D. Vretenar<sup>1,2</sup>, and P. Ring<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Physik-Department der Technischen Universität München,  
D-85748 Garching, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Physics Department, Faculty of Science,  
University of Zagreb, 1000 Zagreb, Croatia

<sup>3</sup> National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory,  
Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48825, USA

February 9, 2008

## Abstract

The Relativistic Hartree Bogoliubov (RHB) model is applied in the description of ground-state properties of proton-rich odd- $Z$  nuclei in the region  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$ . The NL3 effective interaction is used in the mean-field Lagrangian, and pairing correlations are described by the pairing part of the finite range Gogny interaction D1S. The model predicts the location of the proton drip-line, the ground-state quadrupole deformations and one-proton separation energies at and beyond the drip-line, the deformed single-particle orbitals occupied by the odd valence proton, and the corresponding spectroscopic factors. The results of fully self-consistent RHB calculations are compared with available experimental data, and with predictions of the macroscopic-microscopic mass model.

PACS numbers: 21.60.Jz, 21.10.Dr, 21.10.Jx, 23.50.+z, 27.60+j

# 1 Introduction

Models based on the relativistic mean-field approximation provide a microscopically consistent, and yet simple and economical description of the nuclear many-body problem. By adjusting just a few model parameters: coupling constants and effective masses, to global properties of simple, spherical and stable nuclei, it has been possible to describe in detail a variety of nuclear structure phenomena over the whole periodic table, from light nuclei to superheavy elements [1]. When also pairing correlations are included in the self-consistent Hartree-Bogoliubov framework, the relativistic mean-field theory can be applied to the physics of exotic nuclei at the drip-lines.

The relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov (RHB) model represents a relativistic extension of the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) framework. A unified and self-consistent description of mean-field and pairing correlations is especially important in applications to drip-line nuclei. At the drip-lines the separation energy of the last nucleons becomes extremely small or negative, the Fermi level is found close to particle continuum, and the lowest particle-hole or particle-particle modes are embedded in the continuum. The RHB model with finite range pairing interactions has been applied in studies of the halo phenomenon in light nuclei [2, 3], properties of light nuclei near the neutron-drip [4], reduction of the spin-orbit potential in nuclei with extreme isospin values [5], ground-state properties of Ni and Sn isotopes [6], and the deformation and shape coexistence phenomena that result from the suppression of the spherical  $N=28$  shell gap in neutron-rich nuclei [7]. In particular, in Ref. [8] we have applied the RHB model to calculate properties of proton-rich spherical even-even nuclei with  $14 \leq Z \leq 28$  and  $N=18,20,22$ . It has been shown that RHB provides a very good description of binding energies, two-

proton separation energies and proton *rms* radii. Model predictions for the proton drip-line have been found in excellent agreement with shell-model calculations and with results of non-relativistic HF and HFB studies. The position of the two-proton drip-line for even-even nuclei with  $10 \leq Z \leq 82$  has been recently determined with the RMF+BCS model [9]. Results computed with the NL3 effective interaction [10] have been compared with those of the Hartree-Fock+BCS model (effective force Skyrme SIII) [11], the finite-range droplet model (FRDM) [12, 13], and with the available experimental information. In a very recent work [14] we have used the RHB model with finite range pairing for an analysis of the structure of deformed proton-rich odd- $Z$  nuclei in the region  $59 \leq Z \leq 69$ . The location of the proton drip-line, the properties of proton emitters beyond the drip-line, and the deformed single-particle orbitals occupied by the odd valence proton have been compared with available experimental data.

The structure of proton-rich nuclei displays many interesting properties which are important both for nuclear physics and astrophysics. These nuclei are characterized by exotic decay modes, such as the direct emission of charged particles from the ground-state, and  $\beta$ -decay with large  $Q$ -values. The properties of most proton-rich nuclei should also play an important role in the process of nucleosynthesis by rapid-proton capture. The decay by direct proton emission provides the opportunity to study the structure of systems beyond the drip-line. Proton radioactivity from the ground-state is determined by the Coulomb and centrifugal terms of the effective potential. For  $Z \leq 50$ , nuclei beyond the proton drip-line exist only as short lived resonances, and ground-state proton decay probably cannot be observed directly [15]. On the other hand, the relatively high potential energy barrier

enables the observation of ground-state proton emission from medium-heavy and heavy nuclei. At the drip-lines proton emission competes with  $\beta^+$  decay; for heavy nuclei also fission or  $\alpha$  decay can be favored. The proton-drip line has been fully mapped up to  $Z=21$ , and possibly for odd- $Z$  nuclei up to In [15]. Detailed studies of ground-state proton radioactivity have been reported for odd- $Z$  nuclei in the two spherical regions  $51 \leq Z \leq 55$  and  $69 \leq Z \leq 83$ . The systematics of spectroscopic factors is consistent with half-lives calculated in the spherical WKB or DWBA approximations [16, 17, 18]. Recently reported proton decay rates [19] indicate that the missing region of light rare-earth nuclei contains strongly deformed systems at the drip-lines. The lifetimes of deformed proton emitters should provide direct information on the Nilsson configuration occupied by the odd proton, and therefore on the shape of the nucleus.

In the present work we extended the analysis of Ref. [14], and report a detailed study of deformed odd- $Z$  proton-rich nuclei with  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$ . In Sec. 2 we present an outline of the relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov theory and discuss the various approximations and symmetry constraints. In Sec. 3 the model is applied in the calculation of ground-state properties of proton-rich isotopes at and beyond the drip-line. The results are summarized in Sec. 4.

## **2 Relativistic Hartree Bogoliubov model with finite range pairing interaction**

### **2.1 The Relativistic Mean Field Model**

The relativistic mean field theory presents a phenomenological description of the nuclear system. The theory is based on very simple concepts: (i) nucleons are described as point particles, (ii) these particles strictly obey the

rules of relativity and causality, and (iii) they move independently in mean fields which originate from the nucleon-nucleon interaction. Conditions of causality and Lorentz invariance impose that the interaction is mediated by the exchange of point-like effective mesons, which couple to the nucleons at local vertices. The model parameters are the meson masses and their coupling constants. The values of the parameters are adjusted to properties of nuclear matter and experimental data on finite nuclear systems.

On this phenomenological level the different mesons are classified according to the quantum numbers of spin, parity and isospin. The concepts of simplicity, and the desire to keep the number of phenomenological parameters as small as possible, impose that only the most important meson fields should be included in the model. The experimental fact that parity is conserved to a very high degree of accuracy, on the mean field level automatically excludes mesons with negative intrinsic parity. Since the model describes a system with two types of particles: neutrons and protons, it is necessary to introduce both isoscalar and isovector meson fields. Most versions of the relativistic mean-field model, however, do not contain the scalar isovector meson  $\delta$ . From the presently available experimental data it is difficult to determine its effective coupling constant and effective mass, i.e. the same level accuracy is obtained with or without the inclusion of the  $\delta$ -meson. On the other hand, essential for a correct description of properties of finite nuclei is the vector isovector  $\vec{\rho}$ -meson.

The nucleons are described as relativistic particles moving independently in local mean-field meson potentials. The single-nucleon relativistic dynamics is described by the Dirac equation. In contrast to the Schrödinger equation, which contains a single mean-field potential of Woods-Saxon shape and

an independently adjusted spin-orbit potential, the Lorentz structure of the Dirac equation distinguishes between the scalar potential  $S(\mathbf{r})$ , which results from the exchange of spin-zero mesons, and a vector potential induced by spin-one mesons. In addition, the spin-orbit potential is automatically included in the equation of motion, i.e. it does not require an independent strength parameter. The vector potential  $(V_0(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{r}))$  is a four-vector under Lorentz transformations. It is similar in structure to the electromagnetic potentials  $(A_0(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}))$  which occur when the Dirac equation is applied to systems in atomic physics. The time-like component of the vector field  $V_0(\mathbf{r})$  corresponds to the Coulomb field  $A_0(\mathbf{r})$ , and the three space-like components  $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{r})$  are equivalent to the magnetic potential  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$ .

In calculations of properties of ground-state proton emitters we neglect the space-like components of the vector fields, i.e. we neglect nuclear magnetism. For nuclei with even number of protons and neutrons this is certainly justified by the time-reversal invariance of the mean field. In nuclei with an odd number of protons or neutrons, time-reversal symmetry is broken. The odd particle induces polarization currents and time-odd components in the meson fields. The time-odd components are essential for a description of magnetic moments [20], and of moments of inertia in rotating nuclei [21, 22]. The effect on deformations and binding energies, however, is very small and can be neglected to a good approximation. We are then left with the time-like component  $V(\mathbf{r})$  (for simplicity we omit the subscript 0 henceforth). The Lorentz structure of the theory implies that the scalar field is attractive, and that the time-like component of the vector fields is repulsive. Hence, the scalar field can be used to characterize in an economic way the attractive part of the nucleon-nucleon interaction at intermediate distances, and the

vector fields describe the repulsion at short distances.

Under these simplifying assumptions the single-nucleon dynamics is described by the Dirac equation, which contains only the time-like component of the vector potential  $V$  and the scalar potential  $S$ . In the stationary case it reduces to an eigenvalue problem

$$\hat{h}_D \psi_i = \{\alpha \mathbf{p} + V(\mathbf{r}) + \beta[m - S(\mathbf{r})]\} \psi_i = \epsilon_i \psi_i. \quad (1)$$

This equation contains the four-dimensional Dirac matrices  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , and the nucleons with rest mass  $m$  are represented by the four-dimensional vectors  $\psi_i$ . Expressed in terms of the Pauli spin matrices, the equation reads

$$\begin{pmatrix} m - S + V & \sigma \mathbf{p} \\ \sigma \mathbf{p} & -m + S + V \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix}_i = \epsilon_i \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix}_i. \quad (2)$$

The single-particle wave functions  $\psi_i$  are four-dimensional spinors. The subscript  $i$  denotes the quantum numbers that specify the single-particle state, and  $\epsilon_i$  is the corresponding energy. In the *no-sea approximation* the Dirac sea of solutions with negative eigenvalues does not contribute to the densities and currents. Performing only the summation over the occupied orbitals in the Fermi sea, the bilinear products of wave functions are used to construct two types of densities: (i) the baryon density

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^A \psi_i^\dagger \psi_i = \sum_{i=1}^A [f_i^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) f_i(\mathbf{r}) + g_i^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) g_i(\mathbf{r})], \quad (3)$$

which is the zero component of the four-vector baryon current, and (ii) the scalar density

$$\rho_s(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^A \bar{\psi}_i \psi_i = \sum_{i=1}^A [f_i^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) f_i(\mathbf{r}) - g_i^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) g_i(\mathbf{r})]. \quad (4)$$

The fields  $V(\mathbf{r})$  and  $S(\mathbf{r})$  are computed by averaging over the interactions induced by the exchange of vector and scalar mesons, respectively

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = \int v_v(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r', \quad (5)$$

$$S(\mathbf{r}) = \int v_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho_s(\mathbf{r}') d^3r. \quad (6)$$

The two-body interactions  $v_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  and  $v_v(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  are of Yukawa type. They correspond to the exchange of the scalar isoscalar  $\sigma$ -meson, and vector mesons:  $\omega$  (isoscalar) and  $\vec{\rho}$  (isovector). The resulting fields are defined

$$S(\mathbf{r}) = -g_\sigma \sigma(\mathbf{r}), \quad (7)$$

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = g_\omega \omega(\mathbf{r}) + g_\rho \rho_3(\mathbf{r}) + A_0(\mathbf{r}), \quad (8)$$

where  $\sigma(\mathbf{r})$ ,  $\omega(\mathbf{r})$ ,  $\rho_3(\mathbf{r})$  are the classical mesons fields, and  $A_0(\mathbf{r})$  is the Coulomb field (exchange of photons). The mesons fields are solutions of the Klein-Gordon equations

$$(-\Delta + m_\sigma)\sigma(\mathbf{r}) = -g_\sigma \rho_s(\mathbf{r}), \quad (9)$$

$$(-\Delta + m_\omega)\omega(\mathbf{r}) = g_\omega \rho(\mathbf{r}), \quad (10)$$

$$(-\Delta + m_\rho)\rho_3(\mathbf{r}) = g_\rho(\rho_n(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_p(\mathbf{r})), \quad (11)$$

$$-\Delta A_0(\mathbf{r}) = e^2 \rho_c(\mathbf{r}), \quad (12)$$

$m_\sigma$ ,  $m_\omega$ , and  $m_\rho$  are the masses of the  $\sigma$ -meson, the  $\omega$ -meson, and the  $\rho$ -meson, respectively.  $g_\sigma$ ,  $g_\omega$ , and  $g_\rho$  are the corresponding coupling constants for the mesons to the nucleon, and  $e^2/4\pi = 1/137.036$ .  $\rho_c(\mathbf{r})$  is the charge density. The interactions that result from the Yukawa and Coulomb type Green's function are

$$v_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = -\frac{g_\sigma^2}{4\pi} \frac{e^{-m_\sigma|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}, \quad (13)$$

$$v_v(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{g_\omega^2}{4\pi} \frac{e^{-m_\omega|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|} + \vec{\tau} \vec{\tau}' \frac{g_\rho^2}{4\pi} \frac{e^{-m_\rho|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|} + \frac{e^2}{4\pi} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\vec{\tau}$  are the isospin matrices.

In the mean-field approximation the mesons are introduced only on a phenomenological level as carriers of the fields. On a more fundamental level,

one should certainly try to relate these effective mesons to physical mesons. For the vector mesons  $\omega$  and  $\rho$  this relation is relatively well established. The effective masses computed from the experimental properties of finite nuclei are very close to the free values. In fact, in many successful parameter sets reported in the literature, one finds that the bare values have been used for the masses of the  $\omega$  and  $\rho$  mesons. This choice reduces the number of free model parameters by 2. In the scalar sector, however, the phenomenological level of the model becomes evident. A physical scalar isoscalar meson has not been observed. On the other hand, it is well known that the one-pion exchange determines the nucleon-nucleon interaction at large distances. In the region of intermediate distances the interaction is predominantly the correlated two-pion exchange and the two-pion exchange with a  $\Delta$ -particle in the intermediate state. Both processes result in a parity-conserving mean field, which in the RMF model is described by the scalar field  $S(\mathbf{r})$ . In principle, the Lorentz structure would allow a pseudo-scalar field which originates from the one-pion exchange. On the Hartree level, however, this contribution vanishes due to parity conservation, and therefore the pion contributes only through the two-pion exchange.

Summarizing in a formal way our considerations, RMF can be formulated as an effective field theory, starting from the Lagrangian density originally introduced by Walecka [23]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} = & \bar{\psi} (i\gamma \cdot \partial - m) \psi + \frac{1}{2}(\partial\sigma)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_\sigma\sigma^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\mu\nu}\Omega^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}m_\omega^2\omega^2 - \frac{1}{4}\vec{R}_{\mu\nu}\vec{R}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}m_\rho^2\vec{\rho}^2 - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \\
& - g_\sigma\bar{\psi}\sigma\psi - g_\omega\bar{\psi}\gamma \cdot \omega\psi - g_\rho\bar{\psi}\gamma \cdot \vec{\rho}\vec{\tau}\psi - e\bar{\psi}\gamma \cdot A\frac{(1-\tau_3)}{2}\psi \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

Vectors in isospin space are denoted by arrows, and bold-faced symbols will indicate vectors in ordinary three-dimensional space.  $\Omega^{\mu\nu}$ ,  $\vec{R}^{\mu\nu}$ , and  $F^{\mu\nu}$  are

the field tensors of the vector fields  $\omega$ ,  $\rho$ , and of the photon:

$$\Omega^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu \omega^\nu - \partial^\nu \omega^\mu \quad (16)$$

$$\vec{R}^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu \vec{\rho}^\nu - \partial^\nu \vec{\rho}^\mu \quad (17)$$

$$F^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A^\nu - \partial^\nu A^\mu. \quad (18)$$

If the bare masses  $m$ ,  $m_\omega$ , and  $m_\rho$  are used for the nucleons and the  $\omega$  and  $\rho$  mesons, there are only four free model parameters:  $m_\sigma$ ,  $g_\sigma$ ,  $g_\omega$  and  $g_\rho$ . Their values can be adjusted to the experimental data on just few spherical nuclei. This simple model, however, is not flexible enough for a quantitative description of properties of complex nuclear systems. An effective density dependence is introduced [24] by replacing the quadratic  $\sigma$ -potential  $\frac{1}{2}m_\sigma^2\sigma^2$  with a quartic potential  $U(\sigma)$

$$U(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}m_\sigma^2\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{3}g_2\sigma^3 + \frac{1}{4}g_3\sigma^4. \quad (19)$$

The potential includes the nonlinear  $\sigma$  self-interaction, with two additional parameters  $g_2$  and  $g_3$ . The corresponding Klein-Gordon equation (9) becomes nonlinear, with a  $\sigma$ -dependent mass  $m_\sigma^2(\sigma) = m_\sigma^2 + g_2\sigma + g_3\sigma^2$ . More details on the relativistic mean-field formalism can be found in Refs. [1, 23, 25, 26].

The essential structure of the model is based on relativity. In a description of the ground-state properties of nuclei we are certainly faced with the question: why is it necessary to use a relativistic formulation? In fact, the kinetic energies and the Fermi momenta are relatively small compared to the rest mass of the nucleon. Therefore, relativistic kinematics can be neglected. The Dirac equation, however, contains more than just the difference  $V(\mathbf{r}) - S(\mathbf{r})$ . Compared to an equivalent Schrödinger equation with a potential well of  $\sim 50$  MeV (small compared to the nucleon rest mass of 939 MeV), the Dirac equation contains two potentials:  $V(\mathbf{r})$  and  $-S(\mathbf{r})$ , which are both

large ( $\sim 350$  and  $\sim -400$  MeV) and opposite in sign. Therefore, one needs a relativistic framework in order to properly describe the dynamics of these strong potentials. In the equation (2) for the large component  $f$ , only the difference between  $V$  and  $S$  enters, and this potential is, in fact, small compared to the nucleon rest mass. In the lower equation for the small components  $g$ , the sum  $V+S$  occurs. This term is large and it produces the strong spin-orbit potential, which is essential in nuclear structure calculations. One of the advantages of working in a relativistic framework is also being able to determine the strength and the shape of the spin-orbit term self-consistently. This is especially important for a correct description of spin-orbit splittings in regions of nuclei far from the valley of  $\beta$  stability, where the extrapolation of effective strength parameters becomes questionable. Another example of the importance of describing the single-nucleon wave functions with Dirac spinors, is the occurrence of approximate pseudo-spin symmetry in nuclear spectra. The symmetry has its origin in the approximate cancellation of the scalar and vector potentials in the single-nucleon Dirac equation[27].

It should also be emphasized that the smallness of  $V-S$  leads to relatively small Fermi momenta and allows, in principle, a non-relativistic reduction of the Dirac equation to a Schrödinger equation with momentum-dependent potentials. The resulting non-relativistic theory with additional spin- and momentum-dependent terms requires, in general, more adjustable parameters, and one can argue that its predictive power is reduced as compared to a fully relativistic theory.

## 2.2 Relativistic Theory with Pairing Correlations

The inclusion of pairing correlations is essential for a correct description of structure phenomena in spherical open-shell nuclei and in deformed nuclei.

The relativistic mean field theory, as described in the previous section, does not include such correlations. The Dirac Hamiltonian contains only single-particle field operators with the structure  $\psi^\dagger\psi$ ; pairing correlations can only be described in a generalized single-particle theory by field operators  $\psi^\dagger\psi^\dagger$  and  $\psi\psi$ , which do not conserve the particle number. Pairing correlations are therefore often included in a phenomenological way with the simple BCS approximation [28]. However, the BCS model presents only a poor approximation for exotic nuclei far from the valley of  $\beta$ -stability. The physics of drip-line nuclei necessitates a unified and self-consistent treatment of mean-field and pairing correlations. In the non-relativistic approach, properties of drip line nuclei are consistently described in the framework of Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) theory [29]. The relativistic extension of the HFB theory was introduced in Ref. [30]. The starting point is again the Lagrangian (15). By performing the quantization of the meson fields, the relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov equations are derived using Green's function techniques.

As in non-relativistic HFB theory, the ground state of a nucleus  $|\Phi\rangle$  is described as the vacuum with respect to independent quasi-particle operators, which are defined by a unitary Bogoliubov transformation of the single-nucleon creation and annihilation operators. The generalized single-nucleon Hamiltonian contains two average potentials: the self-consistent Hartree-Fock field  $\hat{\Gamma}$  which encloses all the long range  $ph$  correlations, and a pairing field  $\hat{\Delta}$  which sums up the  $pp$ -correlations. In the relativistic extension the Hartree approximation is employed for the self-consistent mean-field, and the resulting Relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov (RHB) equations read

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{h}_D - m - \lambda & \hat{\Delta} \\ -\hat{\Delta}^* & -\hat{h}_D + m + \lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_k(\mathbf{r}) \\ V_k(\mathbf{r}) \end{pmatrix} = E_k \begin{pmatrix} U_k(\mathbf{r}) \\ V_k(\mathbf{r}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

where  $\hat{h}_D$  is the single-nucleon Dirac Hamiltonian (1), and  $m$  is the nucleon

mass. The chemical potential  $\lambda$  has to be determined by the particle number subsidiary condition, in order that the expectation value of the particle number operator in the ground state equals the number of nucleons. The column vectors denote the quasi-particle wave functions, and  $E_k$  are the quasi-particle energies.

As it is well known, from the non-relativistic Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov theory and the detailed discussion in Ch. 7 of Ref. [31], for each of the positive quasiparticle energies  $E_k > 0$  with eigenvector  $(U_k, V_k)$  exists an eigensolution  $-E_k$  with eigenvector  $(V_k^*, U_k^*)$ . One has to choose for each quantum number  $k$  one of these solutions. In Hartree-Fock calculations this corresponds to the choice of a certain occupation-pattern for the Slater determinant. For the calculation of the ground state of an even-even nucleus one occupies the lowest levels starting from the bottom of the well, i.e. one chooses the lowest  $A$  single-particle levels. In the HFB case the ground-state of an even-even system is obtained by choosing only the positive quasi-particle energies (see Ref. [31] for exceptions of this rule in the case of rotating nuclei). To describe odd nuclei one has to block at least one level  $k_0$ . This means that one has to choose for  $k_0$  the negative eigenvalue  $-E_{k_0}$  with the eigenvector  $(V_{k_0}^*, U_{k_0}^*)$ . Therefore, in the following equations summations over  $k$  run only over half of the eigensolutions of the RHB-equation (20) chosen according to this prescription.

The RHB equations are solved self-consistently, with potentials determined in the mean-field approximation from solutions of Klein-Gordon equations

$$\left[-\Delta + m_\sigma^2\right] \sigma(\mathbf{r}) = -g_\sigma \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) - g_2 \sigma^2(\mathbf{r}) - g_3 \sigma^3(\mathbf{r}) \quad (21)$$

$$\left[-\Delta + m_\omega^2\right] \omega^0(\mathbf{r}) = g_\omega \rho_v(\mathbf{r}) \quad (22)$$

$$\left[-\Delta + m_\rho^2\right] \rho^0(\mathbf{r}) = g_\rho \rho_3(\mathbf{r}) \quad (23)$$

$$-\Delta A^0(\mathbf{r}) = e \rho_p(\mathbf{r}), \quad (24)$$

for the sigma meson, omega meson, rho meson and photon field, respectively. Due to charge conservation, only the 3rd-component of the isovector rho meson contributes. The source terms in equations (21) to (24) are sums of bilinear products of baryon amplitudes

$$\rho_s(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_k V_k^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \gamma^0 V_k(\mathbf{r}), \quad (25)$$

$$\rho_v(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_k V_k^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) V_k(\mathbf{r}), \quad (26)$$

$$\rho_3(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_k V_k^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \tau_3 V_k(\mathbf{r}), \quad (27)$$

$$\rho_{\text{em}}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_k V_k^\dagger(\mathbf{r}) \frac{1 - \tau_3}{2} V_k(\mathbf{r}), \quad (28)$$

where the sums run over all the quasiparticle states with positive energy in even-even nuclei. In odd systems at least one level  $k_0$  has to be blocked, i.e. the corresponding eigenvector  $V_{k_0}(r)$  has to be replaced by  $U_{k_0}^*(r)$ .

The pairing field  $\hat{\Delta}$  in (20) is an integral operator with the kernel

$$\Delta_{ab}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c,d} V_{abcd}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \kappa_{cd}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'), \quad (29)$$

where  $a, b, c, d$  denote quantum numbers which specify the Dirac indices of the spinors,  $V_{abcd}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  are matrix elements of a general two-body interaction.

The eigensolutions of Eq. (20) form a set of orthonormal single quasiparticle states. The corresponding eigenvalues are the single quasi-particle energies. The self-consistent iteration procedure is performed in the basis of quasi-particle states. As shown by Bloch and Messiah in [32], any Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov wave function can also be represented in the form of a BCS

function. For systems with an even number of particles

$$|\Phi\rangle = \prod_{\mu} (u_{\mu} + v_{\mu} a_{\mu}^{\dagger} a_{\bar{\mu}}^{\dagger}) |-\rangle, \quad (30)$$

and for odd particle number

$$|\Phi_{\mu_0}\rangle = a_{\mu_0}^{\dagger} \prod_{\mu \neq \mu_0} (u_{\mu} + v_{\mu} a_{\mu}^{\dagger} a_{\bar{\mu}}^{\dagger}) |-\rangle, \quad (31)$$

where  $\mu_0$  is the level occupied by the odd particle (blocked level).

The operators  $a_{\mu}^{\dagger}$  and  $a_{\bar{\mu}}^{\dagger}$  create particles in the canonical basis, and the occupation probabilities are given by

$$v_{\mu}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_{\mu} - m - \lambda}{\sqrt{(\varepsilon_{\mu} - m - \lambda)^2 + \Delta_{\mu}^2}} \right). \quad (32)$$

$\varepsilon_{\mu} = \langle \mu | h_D | \mu \rangle$  and  $\Delta_{\mu} = \langle \mu | \hat{\Delta} | \bar{\mu} \rangle$  are the diagonal elements of the Dirac single-particle Hamiltonian and the pairing field in the canonical basis, respectively. In contrast to the BCS framework, however, neither of these fields is diagonal in the canonical basis. The basis itself is specified by the requirement that it diagonalizes the single particle density matrix  $\hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \sum_k V_k(\mathbf{r}) V_k^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}')$ . The transformation to the canonical basis determines the energies and occupation probabilities of single-particle states, which correspond to the self-consistent solution for the ground state of a nucleus.

According to the Bloch-Messiah theorem the canonical basis is connected to the quasiparticle basis through a unitary transformation (usually called *C*-transformation). Only in the HF+BCS case this transformation is proportional to unity. Therefore, the blocked level  $\mu_0$  in Eq. (31), which is a basis vector of the canonical basis, is in general different from the blocked quasiparticle level  $k_0$  discussed after Eq. (20). However, according to the Bloch-Messiah theorem a density matrix  $\hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ , obtained after blocking the quasiparticle level  $k_0$ , has always one eigenvalue 1 and one eigenvalue 0 in

addition to the doubly degenerate eigenvalues  $v_\mu^2$ . Neglecting degeneracies, there is a unique relation between the quasiparticle level  $k_0$  and the blocked level  $\mu_0$  in the canonical basis. In case of symmetries both levels  $\mu_0$  and  $k_0$  have identical quantum numbers while in cases where the matrix  $C$  is close to unity, the corresponding wavefunctions are similar.

In many applications of the relativistic mean-field model pairing correlations have been taken into account in a very phenomenological way in the BCS model with the monopole pairing force, adjusted to the experimental odd-even mass differences. This framework obviously cannot be applied to the description of the coupling to the particle continuum in nuclei close to drip-line. The question therefore arises, which pairing interaction  $V_{abcd}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  should be used in Eq. (18). In Ref. [30] a fully relativistic derivation of the pairing force has been developed, starting from the Lagrangian (1). Using the Gorkov factorization technique, it has been possible to demonstrate that the pairing interaction results from the one-meson exchange ( $\sigma$ -,  $\omega$ - and  $\rho$ -mesons), and is therefore of the form (13) and (14). In practice, however, it turns out that the pairing correlations calculated in this way, with coupling constants taken from the standard parameter sets of the RMF model, are too strong. The repulsion produced by the exchange of vector mesons at short distances results in a pairing gap at the Fermi surface that is by a factor three too large. However, as has been argued in many applications of the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov theory, there is no real reason to use the same effective forces in both the particle-hole and particle-particle channels. In the ladder approximation, the effective interaction contained in the mean-field  $\hat{\Gamma}$  is a G-matrix, the sum over all ladder diagrams. The effective force in the  $pp$  channel, i.e. in the pairing potential  $\hat{\Delta}$ , should be the K matrix, the sum

of all diagrams irreducible in the  $pp$ -direction (see for instance [33]). Since very little is known about this matrix in the relativistic approach, in most applications of the RHB model a phenomenological pairing interaction has been used, the pairing part of the Gogny force,

$$V^{pp}(1,2) = \sum_{i=1,2} e^{-((\mathbf{r}_1-\mathbf{r}_2)/\mu_i)^2} (W_i + B_i P^\sigma - H_i P^\tau - M_i P^\sigma P^\tau), \quad (33)$$

with the set D1S [34] for the parameters  $\mu_i$ ,  $W_i$ ,  $B_i$ ,  $H_i$  and  $M_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ).

Although this procedure formally breaks the Lorentz structure of the equations, one has to keep in mind that pairing in itself is a completely non-relativistic phenomenon. The essential point in a relativistic description of nuclei is the difference between the scalar and the vector density, which yields saturation, together with the approximate cancellation of the scalar attraction by the vector repulsion, for the large components in the Dirac equation. The addition of the scalar and vector potentials for the small components, results in large energy splitting between spin-orbit partners. The admixture of small components through the kinetic term  $\sigma \mathbf{p}$  in the off-diagonal part of the Dirac equation, has no counterpart in the pairing field. Relativistic effects are only important for the mean field part of Hartree- Bogoliubov theory. The pairing density  $\kappa$  and the corresponding pairing field, result from the scattering of pairs in the vicinity of the Fermi surface. The pairing density is concentrated in an energy window of less than 50 MeV around the Fermi level, i.e. the contributions from the small components to the pairing tensor  $\kappa$  are extremely small. The word *relativistic* in RHB, therefore, applies always to the Hartree  $ph$ -channel of this theory; the Bogoliubov  $pp$ -channel is never relativistic. Consequently, it is justified to approximate the pairing force by the best currently available non-relativistic interaction: the pairing part of the Gogny-force. This is certainly more realistic than a one-meson

exchange force in the pairing channel, since this type of interactions have never been optimized for the description of pairing properties.

## 2.3 Deformed Dirac-Hartree-Bogoliubov Equations

The self-consistent solution of the Dirac-Hartree-Bogoliubov integro-differential eigenvalue equations and Klein-Gordon equations for the meson fields determines the nuclear ground state. For systems with spherical symmetry, i.e. single closed-shell nuclei, the coupled system of equations has been solved using finite element methods in coordinate space [3, 4, 5, 35, 36], and by expansion in a basis of spherical harmonic oscillator [6, 8, 39]. For deformed nuclei the present version of the model does not include solutions in coordinate space. The Dirac-Hartree-Bogoliubov equations and the equations for the meson fields are solved by expanding the nucleon spinors  $U_k(\mathbf{r})$  and  $V_k(\mathbf{r})$ , and the meson fields, in terms of the eigenfunctions of a deformed axially symmetric oscillator potential [28]. For nuclei at the drip-lines, however, solutions in configurational representation might not provide an accurate description of properties that crucially depend on the spatial extension of nucleon densities, as for example nuclear radii. In less exotic nuclei on the neutron rich side, or for proton-rich nuclei, an expansion in a large oscillator basis should provide sufficiently accurate solutions. In particular, proton-rich nuclei are stabilized by the Coulomb barrier which tends to localize the proton density in the nuclear interior and thus prevents the formation of objects with extreme spatial extension.

The current version of the model describes axially symmetric deformed shapes. For this geometry the rotational symmetry is broken and the total angular momentum  $j$  is no longer a good quantum number. However, the densities and fields are still invariant with respect to a rotation around the

symmetry axis, which is taken to be the z-axis. It is then natural to use cylindrical coordinates to represent the solutions of the RHB equations. In particular, the single-nucleon spinors  $U(\mathbf{r})$  and  $V(\mathbf{r})$  in (9) are characterized by the quantum numbers  $[\Omega, \pi, t_3]$ .  $\Omega$  is the eigenvalue of the symmetry operator  $j_z$  (the projection of the total angular momentum on the symmetry axis),  $\pi$  is the parity, and  $t_3$  the isospin projection. The two Dirac spinors  $U(\mathbf{r})$  and  $V(\mathbf{r})$  are defined as

$$U(\mathbf{r}, s, t) = \begin{pmatrix} f_U(\mathbf{r}, s, t) \\ ig_U(\mathbf{r}, s, t) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \begin{pmatrix} f_U^+(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega-1/2)\varphi} \\ f_U^-(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega+1/2)\varphi} \\ ig_U^+(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega-1/2)\varphi} \\ ig_U^-(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega+1/2)\varphi} \end{pmatrix} \chi_{t_3}(t) \quad (34)$$

and

$$V(\mathbf{r}, s, t) = \begin{pmatrix} f_V(\mathbf{r}, s, t) \\ ig_V(\mathbf{r}, s, t) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \begin{pmatrix} f_V^+(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega-1/2)\varphi} \\ f_V^-(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega+1/2)\varphi} \\ ig_V^+(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega-1/2)\varphi} \\ ig_V^-(z, r_\perp) e^{i(\Omega+1/2)\varphi} \end{pmatrix} \chi_{t_3}(t) \quad (35)$$

The basis expansion method starts from the deformed axially symmetric oscillator potential

$$V_{osc}(z, r_\perp) = \frac{1}{2}M\omega_z^2 z^2 + \frac{1}{2}M\omega_\perp^2 r_\perp^2. \quad (36)$$

Imposing volume conservation, the two oscillator frequencies  $\hbar\omega_\perp$  and  $\hbar\omega_z$  can be expressed in terms of a deformation parameter  $\beta_0$ :

$$\hbar\omega_z = \hbar\omega_0 \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{5}{4\pi}}\beta_0\right) \quad (37)$$

$$\hbar\omega_\perp = \hbar\omega_0 \exp\left(+\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{5}{4\pi}}\beta_0\right). \quad (38)$$

The corresponding oscillator length parameters are

$$b_z = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{M\omega_z}} \quad \text{and} \quad b_\perp = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{M\omega_\perp}} \quad (39)$$

Because of volume conservation,  $b_\perp^2 b_z = b_0^3$ . The basis is now specified by the two constants  $\hbar\omega_0$  and  $\beta_0$ . The eigenfunctions of the deformed harmonic oscillator potential are characterized by the quantum numbers

$$|\alpha\rangle = |n_z, n_r, m_l, m_s\rangle, \quad (40)$$

where  $m_l$  and  $m_s$  are the components of the orbital angular momentum and the spin along the symmetry axis, respectively. The eigenvalue of  $j_z$ , which is a conserved quantity in these calculations, is

$$\Omega = m_l + m_s, \quad (41)$$

and the parity is given by

$$\pi = (-)^{n_z + m_l}. \quad (42)$$

The eigenvectors can be explicitly written as a product of functions

$$\Phi_\alpha(z, r_\perp, \varphi, s, t) = \phi_{n_z}(z) \phi_{n_r}^{m_l}(r_\perp) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{im_l\varphi} \chi_{m_s}(s) \chi_{t_\alpha}(t) \quad (43)$$

$$= \Phi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, s) \chi_{t_\alpha}(t), \quad (44)$$

with

$$\phi_{n_z}(z) = \frac{N_{n_z}}{\sqrt{b_z}} H_{n_z}(\zeta) e^{-\zeta^2/2} \quad (45)$$

$$\phi_{n_r}^{m_l}(r_\perp) = \frac{N_{n_r}^{m_l}}{b_\perp} \sqrt{2} \eta^{m_l/2} L_{n_r}^{m_l}(\eta) e^{-\eta/2}, \quad (46)$$

and

$$\zeta = z/b_z, \quad \eta = r_\perp^2/b_\perp^2. \quad (47)$$

$H_n(\zeta)$  and  $L_n^m(\eta)$  denote the Hermite and associated Laguerre polynomials, respectively. The normalization constants are given by

$$N_{n_z} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sqrt{\pi} 2^{n_z} n_z!}} \quad \text{and} \quad N_{n_r}^{m_l} = \sqrt{\frac{n_r!}{(n_r + m_l)!}}. \quad (48)$$

For the nucleon spinors  $U(\mathbf{r})$  and  $V(\mathbf{r})$  in Eqs. (34) and (35), the following expansion in terms of the eigenfunctions is used

$$f_{U(V)}(\mathbf{r}, s, t) = \sum_{\alpha}^{\alpha_{max}} f_{U(V)\alpha} \Phi_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, s) \chi_{t_i}(t) \quad (49)$$

$$g_{U(V)}(\mathbf{r}, s, t) = \sum_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{\tilde{\alpha}_{max}} g_{U(V)\tilde{\alpha}} \Phi_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}, s) \chi_{t_i}(t). \quad (50)$$

In order to avoid the occurrence of spurious states, the quantum numbers  $\alpha_{max}$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}_{max}$  are chosen in such a way, that the corresponding major quantum numbers  $N = n_z + 2n_{\rho} + m_l$  are not larger than  $N_F + 1$  for the expansion of the small components, and not larger than  $N_F$  for the expansion of the large components [28].

The solutions for the fields of massive mesons are also obtained with an expansion in a deformed oscillator basis. It is convenient to use the same deformation parameter  $\beta_0$  as for the fermion fields, and to choose the oscillator length  $b_B = b_0/\sqrt{2}$  :

$$\phi(z, r_{\perp}) = \frac{1}{b_B^{3/2}} e^{-\zeta^2/2 - \eta/2} \sum_{n_z n_r}^{N_B} \phi_{n_z n_r} N_{n_z} H_{n_z}(\zeta) \sqrt{2} L_{n_r}^0(\eta), \quad (51)$$

with  $\zeta = \sqrt{2}z/b_z$  and  $\eta = 2r_{\perp}^2/b_{\perp}^2$ . Inserting this ansatz into the Klein-Gordon equation, an inhomogeneous set of linear equations is obtained

$$\sum_{n_z' n_r'}^{N_B} \mathcal{H}_{n_z n_r n_z' n_r'} \phi_{n_z' n_r'} = s_{n_z n_r}^{\phi}, \quad (52)$$

with the matrix elements

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{n_z n_r n_z' n_r'} &= m_{\phi}^2 \delta_{n_r n_r'} \delta_{n_z n_z'} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2b_z^2} ((2n_z + 1) \delta_{n_z n_z'} - n_z' \delta_{n_z' n_z + 1} - n_z \delta_{n_z n_z' + 1}) \delta_{n_r n_r'} \\ &+ \frac{1}{b_{\perp}^2} ((2n_r + 1) \delta_{n_r n_r'} + n_r' \delta_{n_r' n_r + 1} + n_r \delta_{n_r n_r' + 1}) \delta_{n_z n_z'} \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Most of our calculations are performed by expansion in 12 oscillator shells for the fermion fields, and 20 shells for the boson fields. In order to test the

convergence, critical cases are also calculated with 14 shells for the fermion fields.

## 2.4 Systems with Odd Number of Particles

In the study of proton emitters nuclei with both even and odd number of protons (neutrons) must be calculated. The RHB wave function of a system with an odd number of particles is represented by the product state (31) in the canonical basis. Therefore, for a nucleus with odd proton (neutron) number, one proton (neutron) level must be blocked. If both  $Z$  and  $N$  are odd, one proton level and one neutron level must be blocked. As described in Ref. [31], a quasiparticle level  $k$  is blocked by exchanging the two eigensolutions  $(U_k, V_k)$  and  $(V_k^*, U_k^*)$  of the RHB-equations (20). The blocking procedure is performed in each step of the self-consistent iteration. The resulting density matrix and pairing tensor, in the oscillator basis, read [37, 38]

$$\rho_{\alpha\alpha'}^{(k)} = \rho_{\alpha\alpha'} + U_{\alpha k} U_{\alpha' k}^* - V_{\alpha k}^* V_{\alpha' k}, \quad (54)$$

$$\kappa_{\alpha\alpha'}^{(k)} = \kappa_{\alpha\alpha'} + U_{\alpha k} V_{\alpha' k}^* - V_{\alpha k}^* U_{\alpha' k}, \quad (55)$$

where

$$\rho_{\alpha\alpha'} = (V^* V^T)_{\alpha\alpha'} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_{\alpha\alpha'} = (V^* U^T)_{\alpha\alpha'} \quad (56)$$

are the corresponding matrices for the system without blocking. Each blocked level, of course, produces a different solution for the ground state. It might happen that several quasiparticle levels available to the odd proton (neutron) are found close in energy. This case is especially important for deformed nuclei. In order to determine the self-consistent solution for the ground state, each available level has to be blocked in turn. The ground state then corresponds to the self-consistent solution with lowest energy. Separation energies and spectroscopic factors of proton emitters are calculated from the

self-consistent ground state RHB solutions for the parent system (odd  $Z$ ) and daughter nucleus (even  $Z$ ). Of course, both nuclei can have an odd number of neutrons, in which case calculations with blocked neutron levels must be performed.

### 3 Proton drip-line and deformed ground-state proton emitters

In the present work the relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov theory is applied in the description of ground-state properties of deformed proton-rich odd  $Z$  nuclei in the region  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$ . In particular, the RHB model is used to study the location of the proton drip-line, the ground-state quadrupole deformations and one-proton separation energies at and beyond the drip-line, the deformed single-particle orbitals occupied by the odd valence proton, and the corresponding spectroscopic factors.

The input parameters of the RHB model are the coupling constants and the masses for the effective mean-field Lagrangian, and the effective interaction in the pairing channel. As we have done in most of our recent studies, we use the NL3 effective interaction [10] for the RMF Lagrangian. Properties calculated with NL3 indicate that this is probably the best effective interaction so far, both for nuclei at and away from the line of  $\beta$ -stability. A very recent systematic theoretical study of ground-state properties of more than 1300 even-even isotopes has shown excellent agreement with experimental data [40]. For the pairing field we employ the pairing part of the Gogny interaction with the parameter set D1S [34]. As we have already discussed in the previous section, this force has been very carefully adjusted to the pairing properties of finite nuclei all over the periodic table.

In Figs. 1 and 2 the one-proton separation energies

$$S_p(Z, N) = B(Z, N) - B(Z - 1, N), \quad (57)$$

are displayed for the odd- $Z$  nuclei  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$ , as function of the number of neutrons. The model predicts the drip-line nuclei:  $^{110}\text{I}$ ,  $^{115}\text{Cs}$ ,  $^{118}\text{La}$ ,  $^{124}\text{Pr}$ ,  $^{129}\text{Pm}$ ,  $^{134}\text{Eu}$ ,  $^{139}\text{Tb}$ ,  $^{146}\text{Ho}$ , and  $^{152}\text{Tm}$ . For nuclei with  $Z > 50$ , the superposition of the Coulomb and centrifugal potentials results in a relatively high potential energy barrier, through which the tunneling of the odd proton proceeds. For the ground-state proton emission to occur, the valence proton must penetrate the wide potential barrier, and this process competes with  $\beta^+$  decay. The half-life of the decay strongly depends on the energy of the proton, i.e. on the  $Q_p$  value, and on the angular momentum of the proton state. The  $Q_p$  dependence has been nicely illustrated in Ref. [18], where proton partial decay half-lives for  $^{147}\text{Tm}$  have been calculated in the DWBA. It has been shown that, as the  $Q_p$  value changes from 0.5 MeV to 2.5 MeV, the half-life is reduced by more than 22 orders of magnitude, from  $10^{10}$  sec to  $10^{-12}$  sec for the decay of the  $1d_{3/2}$  state. This means that in many nuclei the ground-state proton emission will not be observed immediately after the drip-line, because for small values of  $Q_p$  the total half-life will be completely dominated by  $\beta^+$  decay. Only for higher values of  $Q_p$  is proton radioactivity expected to dominate over  $\beta^+$  decay. By further decreasing the number of neutrons, the odd proton energy increases rapidly and this results in extremely short proton-emission half-lives. For a typical rare-earth nucleus the  $Q_p$  window in which ground-state proton decay can be directly observed is about 0.8 – 1.7 MeV [18]. An interesting point is that for nuclei at the drip-lines the precise values of the separation energies should also depend on the isovector properties of the spin-orbit interaction. It has been shown

that the relativistic mean-field model encloses a unique isovector dependence of the spin-orbit term of the effective single-nucleon potential [5], very different from the one included in the more traditional non-relativistic models based on Skyrme ansatz. It would be particularly interesting to compare predictions of various models based on the framework of the self-consistent mean-field theory, as it was done, for example, in Ref. [41] for the structure of proton-drip nuclei around the doubly magic  $^{48}\text{Ni}$ .

In Figs. 1 and 2 we display the separation energies of nuclei beyond the drip-line. The energy window extends to include those nuclei for which a direct observation of ground-state proton emission is in principle possible on the basis of calculated separation energies. For the most probable proton emitters, in Table 1 we enclose the ground-state properties calculated in the RHB model. For each nucleus we include the one-proton separation energy  $S_p$ , the quadrupole deformation  $\beta_2$ , the deformed single-particle orbital occupied by the odd valence proton, and the corresponding theoretical spectroscopic factor. In order to determine the Nilsson quantum numbers and the spectroscopic factors, we analyze the wavefunctions of the parent nucleus with an odd proton number and that of the daughter nucleus with even proton number in the canonical basis. Because of the different mean fields and because of the blocking, the canonical basis-systems found in this way are not completely identical for the even and for the odd case. However, the wavefunctions and the occupation numbers  $v_\mu^2$  are in most of the cases rather similar. The essential difference consists in the fact, that one of the pairs of the degenerate occupation numbers  $v_{\mu_0}^2$  does not occur in the odd system. Instead of that we find the occupation numbers 0 and 1. This level is obviously the blocked level  $\mu_0$  in the canonical basis. The Nilsson quantum

numbers of the odd-proton level are determined by the dominant component in the expansion of this wavefunction in terms of the anisotropic oscillator basis (40). The spectroscopic factor of the deformed odd-proton orbital is defined as the probability that this state is found empty in the daughter nucleus with even number of protons. If one neglects the difference of the canonical basis for the even and the odd proton system, the spectroscopic factor of the level  $\mu_0$  is calculated from the Eqs. (30) and (31):

$$S_{\mu_0} = |\langle \Phi_{\mu_0} | a_{\mu_0}^\dagger | \Phi \rangle|^2 = u_{\mu_0}^2. \quad (58)$$

where  $u_{\mu_0}$  is determined in the canonical basis of the daughter nucleus with even proton number.

The results of RHB calculations are compared with the predictions of the finite-range droplet (FRDM) mass model: the projection of the odd-proton angular momentum on the symmetry axis and the parity of the odd-proton state  $\Omega_p^\pi$  [13], the one-proton separation energy [13], and the ground-state quadrupole deformation [12]. The separation energies are also compared with available experimental data on proton transition energies. An excellent agreement is found between ground-state quadrupole deformations calculated in the two theoretical models. In particular, both models predict a transition from prolate to oblate shapes in the Tm isotopes. On the other hand, the predictions for the deformed orbitals occupied by the odd proton differ in many cases. For the I and Cs isotopes, the RHB calculations predict the  $3/2^+[422]$  and  $1/2^+[420]$  proton orbitals, respectively. Exactly the opposite ordering of orbitals is calculated in the macroscopic-microscopic model. The differences are also pronounced in  $^{115,116}\text{La}$ ,  $^{130,131}\text{Eu}$ , and  $^{145}\text{Tm}$ . In order to determine which is the last occupied proton orbital, the corresponding decay width for proton emission should be calculated and compared with the

experiment value. For spherical proton emitters this is a relatively simple task [18], but the extension of the formalism to deformed nuclei is rather involved. Calculations based on the coupled-channel formalism for deformed proton emitters have been reported for  $^{109}\text{I}$  and  $^{113}\text{Cs}$  [42], and more recently in Ref. [43] for  $^{113}\text{Cs}$ . These calculations are not based on a fully microscopic and self-consistent description of proton unstable nuclei, but use a Woods-Saxon potential adjusted in such a way that the energy of the proton quasi-bound state coincides with the experimental transition energy. In particular, even the most realistic calculations do not include pairing correlations, or it is just the spectroscopic factor that is calculated in the simple BCS scheme. In Ref.[42] it was shown that the theoretical half-lives calculated using the proton orbital  $1/2^+[420]$  and  $\beta_2 \approx 0.05 - 0.10$  for  $^{109}\text{I}$ , and  $3/2^+[422]$  and  $\beta_2 \approx 0.10 - 0.15$  for  $^{113}\text{Cs}$ , are consistent with the experimental values.

The RHB and FRDM models predict similar values for the one-proton separation energies of proton emitters with  $Z \geq 59$ . Again, the differences are largest for I and Cs. The RHB predicts stronger binding for I, and weaker binding for Cs. When compared with available experimental proton energies, the FRDM model is very close to experiment for  $^{109}\text{I}$  and  $^{112}\text{Cs}$ , while the RHB model does better for  $^{113}\text{Cs}$ . However, both models fail to reproduce the observed anomaly in the one-proton separation energies of  $^{112}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{113}\text{Cs}$ . The experimental data indicate that  $^{112}\text{Cs}$  is more bound, or better, less unbound. This discrepancy is easily explained. While in the odd-even nucleus  $^{112}\text{Cs}$  the neutrons are all paired off,  $^{113}\text{Cs}$  has an odd number of protons and an odd number of neutrons. Since  $N - Z$  is only 2, one expects a relatively strong interaction between the odd neutron and the odd proton. Compared to the odd-even system, the additional interaction

will increase the binding energy. Such an additional interaction could be represented, for instance, by a surface delta-force. Since the two mean-field models do not include any residual proton-neutron interaction, they cannot reproduce the inversion of the separation energies. The same effect could be also expected for the proton separation energies of  $^{108}\text{I}$  and  $^{109}\text{I}$ . Ground-state proton emission has not been observed in  $^{108}\text{I}$ . The nucleus has been found to be an alpha emitter, with an upper limit for the proton decay branch of 1%. This limit implies a reduction in the  $Q_p$  value of at least 220 keV compared to  $^{109}\text{I}$  [15], and the origin of this additional binding is again the residual interaction between the odd proton and the odd neutron.

The theoretical separation energies are also compared with recently reported experimental data on proton radioactivity from  $^{131}\text{Eu}$ ,  $^{141}\text{Ho}$  [19],  $^{145}\text{Tm}$  [44],  $^{146}\text{Tm}$  [45], and  $^{147}\text{Tm}$  [16]. The  $^{131}\text{Eu}$  transition has an energy  $E_p = 0.950(8)$  MeV and a half-life 26(6) ms, consistent with decay from either  $3/2^+[411]$  or  $5/2^+[413]$  Nilsson orbital. For  $^{141}\text{Ho}$  the transition energy is  $E_p = 1.169(8)$  MeV, and the half-life 4.2(4) ms is assigned to the decay of the  $7/2^- [523]$  orbital. The calculated RHB proton separation energy, both for  $^{131}\text{Eu}$  and  $^{141}\text{Ho}$ , is  $-0.9$  MeV. In the RHB calculation for  $^{131}\text{Eu}$  the odd proton occupies the  $5/2^+[413]$  orbital, while the ground state of  $^{141}\text{Ho}$  corresponds to the  $7/2^- [523]$  proton orbital. This orbital is also occupied by the odd proton in the calculated ground states of  $^{145}\text{Tm}$ ,  $^{146}\text{Tm}$  and  $^{147}\text{Tm}$ . For the proton separation energies we obtain:  $-1.43$  MeV in  $^{145}\text{Tm}$ ,  $-1.20$  MeV in  $^{146}\text{Tm}$ , and  $-0.96$  MeV in  $^{147}\text{Tm}$ . These are compared with the experimental values for transition energies:  $E_p = 1.728(10)$  MeV in  $^{145}\text{Tm}$ ,  $E_p = 1.120(10)$  MeV in  $^{146}\text{Tm}$ , and  $E_p = 1.054(19)$  MeV in  $^{147}\text{Tm}$ . When compared with spherical WKB or DWBA calculations [18], the experimental

half-lives for the three Tm isotopes are consistent with spectroscopic factors for decays from the  $h_{11/2}$  proton orbital. Though our predicted ground-state configuration  $7/2^-$  [523] indeed originates from the spherical  $h_{11/2}$  orbital, we find that these nuclei are deformed.  $^{145}\text{Tm}$  has a prolate quadrupole deformation  $\beta_2 = 0.23$ ;  $^{146}\text{Tm}$  and  $^{147}\text{Tm}$  are oblate in the ground-state with  $\beta_2 = -0.20$  and  $\beta_2 = -0.19$ , respectively. Calculations also predict possible proton emitters  $^{136}\text{Tb}$  and  $^{135}\text{Tb}$  with separation energies  $-0.90$  MeV and  $-1.15$  MeV, respectively. In both isotopes the predicted ground-state proton configuration is  $3/2^+$  [411]. Another possible proton emitter is  $^{130}\text{Eu}$  with separation energy  $-1.22$  MeV and the last occupied proton orbital  $5/2^-$  [532] or  $5/2^+$  [413]. In our calculation these two levels are almost degenerate, and the resulting binding and separation energies are identical.

The calculated mass quadrupole deformation parameters for the odd- $Z$  nuclei  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$  at and beyond the drip line are shown in Fig. 3. While prolate deformations  $0.15 \leq \beta_2 \leq 0.20$  are calculated for most of the I and Cs nuclei, the proton-rich isotopes of La, Pr, Pm, Eu and Tb are strongly prolate deformed ( $\beta_2 \approx 0.30 - 0.35$ ). By increasing the number of neutrons, Ho and Tm display a transition from prolate to oblate shapes. The absolute values of  $\beta_2$  decrease as we approach the spherical solutions at  $N = 82$ . The quadrupole deformations calculated with the RHB/NL3 effective interaction are found in excellent agreement with the predictions of the macroscopic-microscopic mass model [12].

A detailed analysis of single proton levels, including spectroscopic factors, can be performed in the canonical basis which results from the fully microscopic and self-consistent RHB calculations. For the Eu isotopes this is illustrated in Fig. 4, where we display the proton single-particle energies

in the canonical basis as function of the neutron number. The dashed line denotes the position of the Fermi level. The proton energies are the diagonal matrix elements of the Dirac Hamiltonian  $h_D$  in the canonical basis. The phase-space of positive-energy states should not be confused with the continuum of scattering states which asymptotically behave as plane waves. The RHB ground-state wave function can be written either in the quasiparticle basis as a product of independent quasi-particle states, or in the *canonical basis* as a highly correlated BCS-state. In the *canonical basis* nucleons occupy single-particle states. The canonical states are eigenstates of the RHB density matrix. The eigenvalues are the corresponding occupation numbers. In particular, we notice that for the proton emitter  $^{131}\text{Eu}$ , the ground-state corresponds to the odd valence proton in the  $5/2^+[413]$  orbital. For  $^{130}\text{Eu}$  the states  $5/2^+[413]$  and  $5/2^-[532]$  are almost degenerate, and this is an example of a situation in which only the comparison of calculated and measured half-lives can decide which is the last occupied proton orbital. Both for  $^{130}\text{Eu}$  and  $^{131}\text{Eu}$  the macroscopic-microscopic model predicts the last proton orbital to be  $\Omega^\pi = 3/2^+$ , which corresponds to the Nilsson orbital  $3/2^+[411]$ . In the energy diagram of Fig. 4 the states  $5/2^+[413]$  and  $5/2^-[532]$  are closer to the Fermi level for all calculated Eu isotopes.

In Fig. 5 we plot the proton single-particle energies in the canonical basis for the nuclei at the drip-line:  $^{118}\text{La}$ ,  $^{124}\text{Pr}$ ,  $^{129}\text{Pm}$ ,  $^{134}\text{Eu}$ ,  $^{139}\text{Tb}$ . The levels are shown as functions of the number of protons, and again the dashed line denotes the position of the Fermi level. From this diagram one can easily deduce which levels are most likely to be occupied by the odd-proton, at and beyond the drip-line. Figure 5 should be compared with Table 1 for the odd-proton orbitals occupied in the proton emitters. Of course, by further

decreasing the number of neutrons, i.e. by going beyond the drip-line, the proton levels and the Fermi level are shifted upwards in energy. However, as can be seen from Fig. 4 for the Eu isotopes, this increase in energy is very smooth and dramatic changes should not be expected for the occupation of the proton orbitals beyond the drip-line.

In many applications of the HFB and RHB models it has been emphasized how important is the self-consistent treatment of pairing correlations in drip-line nuclei. In order to illustrate the relative contribution of the pairing correlations to the binding energy, for the drip-line nuclei  $51 \leq Z \leq 69$ , in Fig. 6 we display the average values of the proton pairing gaps for occupied canonical states

$$\langle \Delta_p \rangle = \frac{\sum_{[\Omega\pi]} \Delta_{[\Omega\pi]} v_{[\Omega\pi]}^2}{\sum_{[\Omega\pi]} v_{[\Omega\pi]}^2}, \quad (59)$$

where  $v_{[\Omega\pi]}^2$  are the occupation probabilities of the proton orbitals, and  $\Delta_{[\Omega\pi]}$  are the diagonal matrix elements of the pairing part of the RHB single-nucleon Hamiltonian in the canonical basis. The plotted values of  $\langle \Delta_p \rangle$  correspond to the RHB self-consistent solutions for the ground-states of the drip-line nuclei. The pairing correlations vanish for Sb and I. The average proton pairing gap is 1 – 1.5 MeV for drip-line nuclei between  $^{115}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{139}\text{Tb}$ , and it increases to more than 2 MeV for  $^{146}\text{Ho}$  and  $^{152}\text{Tm}$ .

## 4 Conclusions

The relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov theory has been used to study the ground-state properties of deformed proton emitters with  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$ . The principal advantage of working in the relativistic framework is its ability to describe all the nuclear mean fields in a unified and fully self-consistent way. In particular, the spin-orbit term of the effective single-nucleon potential is au-

tomatically included in the relativistic mean-field model. In contrast to non-relativistic models, the strength and isospin dependence of the spin-orbit interaction do not require the introduction of additional free parameters. With the addition of the pairing force, the relativistic Hartree-Bogoliubov theory provides a unified and self-consistent description of mean-field and pairing correlations. This theoretical framework is especially important for applications in exotic nuclei far from the valley of  $\beta$ -stability. The model parameters are the coupling constants and meson masses of the mean-field Lagrangian, and the interaction in the  $pp$  channel. The NL3 parameter set has been used for the mean-field Lagrangian, and pairing correlations have been described by the pairing part of the finite range Gogny interaction D1S. This particular combination of effective forces in the  $ph$  and  $pp$  channels has been used in most of our applications of the RHB theory. The calculated ground-state properties have been found in excellent agreement with experimental data, not only for spherical  $\beta$ -stable nuclei, but also for nuclear systems with large isospin values on both sides of the valley of  $\beta$ -stability. No attempt has been made to adjust the model parameters to the specific properties of nuclei studied in this work.

The model has been used to study the location of the proton drip-line, the ground-state quadrupole deformations and one-proton separation energies at and beyond the drip line, the deformed single particle orbitals occupied by the odd valence proton, and the corresponding spectroscopic factors. The results of fully self-consistent calculations have been compared with predictions of the finite range droplet mass model, and with very recent experimental data on ground-state proton emitters.

The calculated ground-state mass deformation parameters have been found

in excellent agreement with values predicted by the macroscopic-microscopic FRDM model calculations. In particular, both models predict a transition from prolate to oblate shapes in the Tm isotopes. In many cases, however, different single particle orbitals occupied by the odd proton are predicted by the two models. Correspondingly, in these cases relatively large differences for the one-proton separation energies have been calculated. These divergences might be related to the different descriptions of the effective spin-orbit potential. In comparison with recent experimental data on ground-state proton emitters, the calculated one-proton separation energies are in excellent agreement with transition energies in  $^{113}\text{Cs}$ ,  $^{131}\text{Eu}$ ,  $^{141}\text{Ho}$ ,  $^{146}\text{Tm}$ , and  $^{147}\text{Tm}$ . For  $^{145}\text{Tm}$ , however, the calculated and experimental proton energies differ by almost 300 keV. Both the RHB and FRDM models fail to reproduce the observed anomaly in the proton energies of the ground state emitters  $^{112}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{113}\text{Cs}$ . The anomaly can probably be related to the short range proton-neutron interaction, not included in the mean-field models. Summarizing, we have found a remarkable agreement between results of RHB calculations and very recent experimental data on deformed ground-state proton emitters. It should be emphasized that these results have been obtained with the standard RHB parameterization, i.e. no new parameters have been introduced to specifically describe the proton emitters. In addition, the spectroscopic factors which correspond to the fully self-consistent RHB solutions will be useful in calculations of proton partial decay half-lives.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported in part by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung under project 06 TM 875. One of the authors (GAL) acknowledges with thanks the warm hospitality of the National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory at MSU during his stay there.

## References

- [1] P. Ring, Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys. **37**, 193 (1996).
- [2] J. Meng and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3963 (1996).
- [3] W. Pöschl, D. Vretenar, G.A. Lalazissis, and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3841 (1997).
- [4] G.A. Lalazissis, D. Vretenar, W. Pöschl, and P. Ring, Nucl. Phys. **A632**, 363 (1998).
- [5] G.A. Lalazissis, D. Vretenar, W. Pöschl, and P. Ring, Phys. Lett. **B418**, 7 (1998).
- [6] G.A. Lalazissis, D. Vretenar, and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. C **57**, 2294 (1998).
- [7] G.A. Lalazissis, D. Vretenar, P. Ring, M. Stoitsov, and L. Robledo, submitted to Phys. Rev. C
- [8] D. Vretenar, G.A. Lalazissis, and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. C **57**, 3071 (1998).
- [9] G.A. Lalazissis and S. Raman, Phys. Rev. C **58**, 1467 (1998).

- [10] G.A. Lalazissis, J. König and P. Ring; Phys. Rev. **C55**, 540 (1997).
- [11] N. Tajima, S. Takahara, and N. Onishi, Nucl. Phys. **A603**, 23 (1996).
- [12] P. Möller, J.R. Nix, W.D. Myers, and W.J. Swiatecki, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **59**, 185 (1995).
- [13] P. Möller, J.R. Nix, and K.-L. Kratz, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **66**, 131 (1997).
- [14] D. Vretenar, G.A. Lalazissis, and P. Ring, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [15] P.J. Woods and C.N. Davids, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **47**, 541 (1997).
- [16] P.J. Sellin *et al*, Phys. Rev. **C47**, 1933 (1993).
- [17] C.N. Davids *et al*, Phys. Rev. C **55**, 2255 (1997).
- [18] S. Aberg, P.B. Semmes, and W. Nazarewicz, Phys. Rev. **C56**, 1762 (1997).
- [19] C.N. Davids *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1849 (1998).
- [20] U. Hoffmann and P. Ring, Phys. Lett. **214B**, 307 (1988).
- [21] J. König and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3079 (1993).
- [22] A. Afanasjev, J. König, and P. Ring, Nucl. Phys. **A608**, 107 (1996).
- [23] B.D. Serot and D. Walecka; Adv. Nucl. Phys. **16**, 1 (1986)
- [24] J. Boguta and A.R. Bodmer, Nucl. Phys. **A292**, 413 (1977).
- [25] P.-G. Reinhard, Rep. Prog. Phys. **52**, 439 (1989).

- [26] B.D. Serot, Rep. Prog. Phys. **55**, 1855 (1992).
- [27] J.N. Ginocchio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 436 (1997).
- [28] Y.K. Gambhir, P. Ring and A. Thimet, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **198**, 132 (1990).
- [29] J. Dobaczewski, W. Nazarewicz, T. R. Werner, J. F. Berger, C. R. Chinn, and J. Dechargé, Phys. Rev. C **53**, 2809 (1996).
- [30] H. Kucharek and P. Ring, Z. Phys. **A 339**, 23 (1991).
- [31] P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem*, Springer Verlag, New York (1980)
- [32] C. Bloch and A. Messiah, Nucl. Phys. **39**, 95 (1962).
- [33] A.B. Migdal, *Theory of Finite Fermi Systems, Applications to Atomic Nuclei*, Wiley Interscience, New York (1967)
- [34] J.F. Berger, M. Girod and D. Gogny; Nucl. Phys. **A428**, 32 (1984).
- [35] W. Pöschl, D. Vretenar, and P. Ring, Comput. Phys. Commun. **103**, 217 (1997).
- [36] D. Vretenar, W. Pöschl, G.A. Lalazissis, and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. **57**, R1060 (1998).
- [37] P. Ring, R. Beck, and H.J. Mang, Z. Phys. **231** (1970) 10
- [38] J.L. Egido, H.J. Mang, and P. Ring, Nucl. Phys. **A334** (1980) 1
- [39] T. Gonzalez-Llarena, J.L. Egido, G.A. Lalazissis, and P. Ring, Phys. Lett. **B379**, 13 (1996).

- [40] G.A. Lalazissis, S. Raman and P. Ring, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables (1998) in print.
- [41] W. Nazarewicz, J. Dobaczewski, T.R. Werner, J.A. Maruhn, P.-G. Reinhard, K. Rutz, C.R. Chinn, A.S. Umar and M.R. Strayer, Phys. Rev. **C53**, 740 (1996).
- [42] V.P. Bugrov and S.G. Kadenskii, Sov. J. Nuc. Phys. **49**, 967 (1989).
- [43] E. Maglione, L.S. Ferreira, and R.J. Liotta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 538 (1998).
- [44] J.C. Batchelder *et al*, Phys. Rev. **C57**, R1042 (1998).
- [45] K. Livingston *et al*, Phys. Lett. **B312**, 46 (1993).
- [46] R. D. Page *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1798 (1994).

Figure 1: Predictions of the RHB model (NL3 + D1S) for the one-proton separation energies of odd-Z nuclei  $61 \leq Z \leq 69$ , at and beyond the drip-line.

Figure 2: Same as in Fig. 1, but for odd-Z isotopes  $53 \leq Z \leq 59$ .

Figure 3: Self-consistent ground-state quadrupole deformations for odd-Z nuclei  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$ , at and beyond the proton drip-line.

Figure 4: The proton single-particle levels for the Eu isotopes. The dashed line denotes the position of the Fermi level. The energies in the canonical basis correspond to ground-state solutions calculated with the RHB model (NL3 + D1S).

Figure 5: The proton single-particle levels for the isotopes at the proton drip-line  $57 \leq Z \leq 65$ . The energies in the canonical basis are plotted as functions of the proton number  $Z$ , and the dashed line denotes the position of the Fermi level.

Figure 6: Average proton pairing gaps  $\langle \Delta_p \rangle$  for the isotopes at the proton drip-line:  $^{110}\text{I}$ ,  $^{115}\text{Cs}$ ,  $^{118}\text{La}$ ,  $^{124}\text{Pr}$ ,  $^{129}\text{Pm}$ ,  $^{134}\text{Eu}$ ,  $^{139}\text{Tb}$ ,  $^{146}\text{Ho}$ , and  $^{152}\text{Tm}$ .

Table 1: Odd- $Z$  ground-state proton emitters in the region of nuclei with  $53 \leq Z \leq 69$ . Results of the RHB calculation for the one-proton Separation energies  $S_p$ , quadrupole deformations  $\beta_2$ , and the deformed single-particle orbitals occupied by the odd valence proton, are compared with predictions of the macroscopic-microscopic mass model, and with the experimental transition energies. All energies are in units of MeV; the RHB spectroscopic factors are displayed in the sixth column.

|                   | N  | $S_p$ | $\beta_2$ | $p$ -orbital  | $u^2$ | $\Omega_p^\pi$ [13] | $S_p$ [13] | $\beta_2$ [12] | $E_p$ exp.      |
|-------------------|----|-------|-----------|---------------|-------|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| $^{107}\text{I}$  | 54 | -1.40 | 0.15      | $3/2^+[422]$  | 0.84  | $1/2^+$             | -2.14      | 0.14           |                 |
| $^{108}\text{I}$  | 55 | -0.73 | 0.16      | $3/2^+[422]$  | 0.79  | $1/2^+$             | -1.12      | 0.15           |                 |
| $^{109}\text{I}$  | 56 | -0.37 | 0.16      | $3/2^+[422]$  | 0.81  | $1/2^+$             | -0.95      | 0.16           | 0.8126(40) [16] |
| $^{111}\text{Cs}$ | 56 | -1.97 | 0.20      | $1/2^+[420]$  | 0.74  | $3/2^+$             | -1.43      | 0.19           |                 |
| $^{112}\text{Cs}$ | 57 | -1.46 | 0.20      | $1/2^+[420]$  | 0.74  | $3/2^+$             | -0.76      | 0.21           | 0.807(7) [46]   |
| $^{113}\text{Cs}$ | 58 | -0.94 | 0.21      | $1/2^+[420]$  | 0.73  | $3/2^+$             | -0.76      | 0.21           | 0.9593(37) [44] |
| $^{115}\text{La}$ | 58 | -1.97 | 0.26      | $1/2^+[420]$  | 0.20  | $3/2^+$             | -1.50      | 0.27           |                 |
| $^{116}\text{La}$ | 59 | -1.09 | 0.30      | $3/2^- [541]$ | 0.73  | $3/2^+$             | -0.67      | 0.28           |                 |
| $^{119}\text{Pr}$ | 60 | -1.40 | 0.32      | $3/2^- [541]$ | 0.39  | $3/2^-$             | -1.41      | 0.31           |                 |
| $^{120}\text{Pr}$ | 61 | -1.17 | 0.33      | $3/2^- [541]$ | 0.33  | $3/2^-$             | -0.66      | 0.32           |                 |
| $^{124}\text{Pm}$ | 63 | -1.00 | 0.35      | $5/2^- [532]$ | 0.72  | $5/2^-$             | -1.34      | 0.33           |                 |
| $^{125}\text{Pm}$ | 64 | -0.81 | 0.35      | $5/2^- [532]$ | 0.74  | $5/2^-$             | -1.24      | 0.33           |                 |
| $^{130}\text{Eu}$ | 67 | -1.22 | 0.34      | $5/2^- [532]$ | 0.44  | $3/2^+$             | -1.17      | 0.33           |                 |
| $^{131}\text{Eu}$ | 68 | -0.90 | 0.35      | $5/2^+[413]$  | 0.44  | $3/2^+$             | -1.01      | 0.33           | 0.950(8) [19]   |
| $^{135}\text{Tb}$ | 70 | -1.15 | 0.34      | $3/2^+[411]$  | 0.62  | $3/2^+$             | -1.15      | 0.33           |                 |
| $^{136}\text{Tb}$ | 71 | -0.90 | 0.32      | $3/2^+[411]$  | 0.65  | $3/2^+$             | -0.55      | 0.31           |                 |
| $^{140}\text{Ho}$ | 73 | -1.10 | 0.31      | $7/2^- [523]$ | 0.61  | $7/2^-$             | -0.81      | 0.30           |                 |
| $^{141}\text{Ho}$ | 74 | -0.90 | 0.32      | $7/2^- [523]$ | 0.64  | $7/2^-$             | -0.89      | 0.29           | 1.169(8) [19]   |
| $^{145}\text{Tm}$ | 76 | -1.43 | 0.23      | $7/2^- [523]$ | 0.47  | $1/2^+$             | -1.0       | 0.25           | 1.728(10) [44]  |
| $^{146}\text{Tm}$ | 77 | -1.20 | -0.21     | $7/2^- [523]$ | 0.50  | $7/2^-$             | -0.60      | -0.20          | 1.120(10) [45]  |
| $^{147}\text{Tm}$ | 78 | -0.96 | -0.19     | $7/2^- [523]$ | 0.55  | $7/2^-$             | -0.56      | -0.19          | 1.054(19) [16]  |











